

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative, Joshua M. Povsner, on December 20, 2005.

In the outstanding Final Official Action, claims 1-5 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over HOLDEN (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,639). Claims 1-20 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over LaPORTA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,122) in view of VO et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,444).

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 19 will have been amended. In the above-noted telephone interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative agreed that amendments similar to those made herein would overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action. In this regard, Applicants would particularly note that the term "selectively" was discussed during the above-noted interview. However, Applicants' are using the term "either" in place of "selectively" so as to avoid any confusion as to where any such selection occurs.

The Examiner indicated that the above-noted amendments would require further search and consideration. Accordingly, because the present application is after final rejection, Applicants are filing the present response with a request for continued examination.

Applicants submit that the herein-contained amendments should not be considered an indication of Applicants' acquiescence as to the propriety of the outstanding rejections. Rather, Applicants have amended claims of the present

application in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and to obtain early allowance of claims. In this regard, Applicants may submit, in a continuation application, claims that are of a scope similar to the scope of the current claims prior to amendment.

At least in view of the tentative agreement reached in the telephone interview on December 20, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 19.

Applicants further submit that claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-16 and 18 and 20 are allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so. Applicants have amended the claims pursuant to an agreement with the Examiner in a telephone interview on December 20, 2005. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any comments regarding this Response of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Satish PAROLKAR et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

December 22, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191